

## REMARKS

Applicants have fully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Office Action dated December 8, 2006. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4, 6, 10-11, 13, 15 and 19 are amended.

Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the original language of the claims "raise a question as to would the result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result". Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being incomplete. In particular, the Examiner asks, "What is being done once the document is compared." By the foregoing amendments to the claims, independent claims 1 and 10 are provided respectively with "an output means for one of displaying or notifying a user of the detected difference of significantly updated contents" and "an output step of displaying or notifying a user of the detected difference of significantly updated contents".

Support for the added features of claims 1 and 10 can be found on page 6, lines 19-24, page 10, lines 9-16 and the Abstract of the originally-filed application.

Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended to answer the question raised by the Examiner in the Action. It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 10 positively recite a concrete, useful and tangible result and thus are statutory under 35 U.S.C. §101 and are complete under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for the reasons set forth in paragraph 11 of the Action. The foregoing amendments to the claims address each issue raised by the Examiner and replaces the objectionable phrase or words. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 1-20 are fully definite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 15, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,898,836 to Freivald et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Freivald”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Freivald is directed to a change-detection tool indicating degree and location of change of internet documents by comparison of cyclic-redundancy-check (CRC) signatures. According to Freivald, a change-detection web server automatically checks web-page documents for recent changes and a user is notified when a change is detected. (see Abstract of Freivald.) Freivald discloses generating an original checksum for a checked portion of the document where the checked portion is less than the entire document and the checksum is what is stored in the database. Then, Freivald discloses comparing the original checksum with a fresh checksum and a detected change is signaled to a remote client when the fresh checksum does not match the original checksum. The selection means disclosed by Freivald (column 4, lines 30-45) is not the recited “significant updating detection means for detecting a difference between contents of an important part of the input detected electronic document and contents of an important part of the input comparable electronic document” set forth in claim 1. Instead of detecting a difference between important parts of two electronic documents, the

compare means disclosed by Freivald simply signals a match when any of the checksums generated by the parsing means matches the original checksum. Thus, Freivald does not disclose the recited means for one of displaying or notifying a user of the detected difference of significantly updated contents, as Freivald simply generates a signal if a match is detected. This is not the claimed invention.

Figures 5 and 6 of Freivald disclose an operation of a responder for an arbitrary, unstructured document. In this embodiment, a change is determined based on the length of a selected string from the document. A CRC for the selected string is generated by CRC generator 44 and compared to the archived CRC in the record by a comparator. If the length of the archived CRC and the newly-generated CRC match, then the string has been found and no change has occurred. If the CRC's do not match, then another string is generated by continuing through all possible strings of a length in a document copy until a match has been found or the end of the copy is reached without finding a match and therefore indicating a change occurred. While this change is output to an e-mail address on record, the recited significant updating means of the claimed invention includes means for checking whether the contents of the detected difference are significant, as required by independent claims 1 and 10.

Freivald simply determines if a change has occurred. That is, Freivald does not select some parts of an electronic document and then determining in the selected parts whether updates have occurred and whether those updates are significant. Consequently, Freivald cannot anticipate the claimed invention because it fails to disclose each and every recited feature of the claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7-8, 11-14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Freivald in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,910,071 to Quintero et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Quintero”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The secondary reference to Quintero is directed to a surveillance monitoring and automated reporting method for detecting data changes where HTML tag characters may be linked to a linked URL and the HTML tag characters are so linked, then the linked URL can be extracted from the HTML tag characters. This is not disclosure related to extracting important parts from an electronic document as recited in independent claims 1 and 10; nor does Quintero disclose the recited pre-process section of claims 2-3, 6-8, 11-12 and 15-17. Thus, Quintero fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

It is unclear why one of ordinary skill in the art would modify Freivald in view of the teachings of Quintero as Quintero is directed to keyword searches of URLs and Freivald is directed to detecting changes in checksum or pages of a web document. The claimed invention positively recites a detailed process of extracting important parts by 1) using a morphological analysis (claims 5, 8, 14 and 17) and 2) user designating specific frames as important where the specific frames constitute part of an electronic document (claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, and 15-17).

Column 9, lines 15-45 of Quintero, cited by the Examiner, states: “If a change was detected, then the new keyword counts that were generated by the change detection algorithm are added to the database, replacing the counts from the old previous version.” The results of the detected change of Quintero are directed to change and keyword hit notification. That is, only the detected differences are stored in the database as character information. Nowhere does Quintero disclose, teach or suggest that 1) extracting

important parts from a detected electronic document and a comparable electronic document; 2) detecting a difference between contents of the detected electronic document and a comparable electronic document, which is checked to be significant or not; and 3) outputting one of displaying or notifying a user of the detected difference of the significantly updated contents, as required in independent claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, Quintero cannot cure the defects of Freivald, and no combination of Freivald and Quintero would achieve the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued indicating that claims 1-20 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Should the Examiner believe that a conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Catherine M. Voorhees  
Registration No. 33,074  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

CMV/elw  
::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\863127\1